

REMARKS

Status of application

In the Office Action issued on May 5, 2006, the Examiner rejected claim 36 as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner stated that the phrase "the identified person" in claim 36 lacked antecedent basis. On or about May 9, 2006, the Applicant contacted the Examiner and authorized the Examiner to amend claim 36 to change "the identified person" to "an identified person". The application was thereafter allowed by the Examiner (as indicated by the "Allowance Counted" status of the application indicated in PAIR,) and is believed by the Applicant to have entered a secondary review process.

Summary of amendment

On March 8, 2007, the Examiner contacted the undersigned by telephone to discuss the application. In this discussion, the Examiner pointed out that claim 1 was considered in the secondary review process not to recite a concrete, tangible and useful result. The undersigned and the Examiner agreed that the amendment of claim 1 to include language reciting storage and/or display of the selected role, when found, is believed to provide a concrete, tangible and useful result. The Applicant has therefore amended claim 1 to include the step of "when the selected role is found, saving and/or displaying the selected role".

Withdrawal of petition

On January 24, 2007, the Applicant filed a petition to the Commissioner to expedite the secondary review of the application or, alternatively, to make the application special on the basis of actual infringement. On February 28, 2007, the undersigned contacted the Office of Petitions, and was informed that the petition had not been reviewed and would not be reviewed by the Office of Petitions because it was believed to concern a matter to be decided by the Director of the examining group.

Because the petition was intended to expedite the secondary review of the application, and because the secondary review of the application has been completed, petition is moot. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the petition be withdrawn. Further, because the petition was rendered moot by the delay of the Office of Petitions, the Applicant respectfully requests that the fee submitted with the petition be refunded.

Conclusion

By this amendment, the Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests allowance of all claims pending in the application. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

If any extensions of time are necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, the Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. If any fees are inadvertently omitted, or if any additional fees are required, or if any amounts have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3085 of the Law Offices of Mark L. Berrier.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Berrier
Reg. No. 35,066

Dated: 3/8/07

Law Offices of Mark L. Berrier
3811 Bee Caves Road, Suite 204
Austin, Texas 78746
telephone: 512.306.9200
facsimile: 512.306.9952
mberrier@texasIP.com